

(See Page Six)

WORKERS AGE

A Paper Defending the Interests of the Workers and Farmers

VOL. 3, No. 22.

NEW YORK, N. Y., DECEMBER 15, 1934.

PRICE 5 CENTS

Income Tax Shows Wealth Is Concentrating

The redistribution of wealth promised by the New Deal proceeded rapidly in the year 1933 according to the figures on income tax returns for that year just released by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

"Redistribution" however can mean two different things. Those who fed on the ballyhoo of the Blue Eagle looked for a "square deal" for the forgotten man, a better break for the little fellow. But the Bureau of Internal Revenue sees things more realistically. Here is the essence of their report:

Net income of corporations increased by \$654,502,697 in 1933 over 1932 or by more than 35 per cent.

Individual incomes of over \$25,000 a year rose but individual incomes under this amount fell.

Wages and salaries dropped by \$567,000 in 1933 from 1932.

Income from business, sale of real estate, stocks and bonds, government investment etc. all rose.

The number of those receiving incomes of over a million a year rose from twenty in 1923 to forty-six in 1934—more than double.

Is this the trend of the New Deal? The Workers Age has always contended that the Roosevelt policies were building up monopoly capitalism to a hitherto unheard of our viewpoint—the fact that even in its first year under the NRA business was able to increase its profits greatly at the expense of a hundred thousand people who dropped out of the income tax class entirely.

Defenders of the Rooseveltian economics say this is a premature conclusion—that recovery reflects itself first in corporation incomes. A recovery that manifests itself by widening the gulf between big and little incomes augurs badly for those at the bottom of the heap.

C. P. O. Plenum Opens Dec. 28

The New Year's sessions of the National Committee, Communist Party (Opposition) are assuming the proportions of a national conference. Besides the members of the committee, coming from every part of the country, there will also be consultative delegates from every organization of the C.P.O.

The opening session will be held on Friday, December 28, 8 P.M. in Irving Plaza, 15th Street and Irving Place, with comrade Lovestone reporting on The Present Political Situation and The Tasks Before Us. In this report Lovestone will deal with the situation in the international labor movement, the political situation in the country and our attitude to the growing movement for a Labor Party. C.P.O. members will be admitted free on presentation of a membership card in good standing. Admission to others will be 25c.

On Saturday, December 29, 8 P.M. Charles Zimmerman will report on The Situation in The American Labor Movement. This session will be held at Rivera Hall 51 West 14th Street. Rules of admission are the same as for the first session. All other sessions will be closed.

The sessions of the National

HAIL AND FAREWELL!

With this issue the Workers Age ceases to appear in the form familiar to its readers for more than two years, to be replaced by the new Weekly Workers Age.

We close the pages on two historic years in the labor movement. The Workers Age has faithfully recorded that history, forecast a good deal of it, even made some itself. But we close the pages without regret because we are advancing—the labor movement is advancing—to a new epoch of greater achievements.

With the advent of the Weekly Workers Age—you can find more details on Page 8—the new chapter opens. The Workers Age has always been dedicated to the service of American labor. In its weekly form that service will be multiplied many times.

Support, build and strengthen the Weekly Workers Age!

Communist Opposition Calls on C. P. For United Front Action

TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U. S.:

Dear Comrades:

We address this communication to you as an appeal for united action on one of the most important issues facing the American workers today as well as to the cooperation in working out a clear political understanding between our organizations with a view to intimate Communist unity.

There surely can be no question as to the vital necessity of a mass movement against war and fascism in this country at the present time. To be at all effective such a movement must be a workers movement primarily based on the existing mass organizations of labor, with the support, of course, of all other sections of the population opposed to war and fascism. Consequently, its program, its approach, its methods of operation must be such as to appeal to the American workers in their organizations; certainly they should not be such as to repel and alienate them. Unfortunately, those responsible for organizing the American League Against War and Fascism have utterly disregarded these elementary considerations with the result that the American League is now a very narrow organization, practically divorced from the labor movement, embracing hardly more than some Communists and sympathizers together with a few liberals and pacifists. Its militant program or its good intentions should not blind us to the undeniable fact that the American League is not today nor can it become in the future the organizational vehicle of a real movement against war and fascism. Only a new movement on a new and sound basis, can hope to organize the widespread anti-war and anti-fascist sentiment among the working masses. It is manifestly the duty of the Communists to mobilize all their forces to stimulate the development of such a movement, in cooperation, naturally, with all other workers organizations committed to the same end. If we agree as to the necessity and possibility of such organizations of labor, then it should surely be possible for us to get together to work out ways and means of encouraging its development among those sections of organized labor where we have influence.

But we should not be satisfied merely with cooperation on this issue. Never was the unity of Communist forces so essential as it is today, with the fruits of disunity so obvious. Would it not be of the greatest value if we could join in a common effort to bring about a better political understanding between our organizations so as to pave the way to complete unity? Between the Communist Party and the Communist Opposition there is no disagreement on the fundamental principles of Com-

munist. We have repeatedly condemned the vicious political slander of those who, like the Trotskyites, deny the genuinely Communist character of the C.P. and the C.I. What separates us are very serious differences on questions of strategy, tactics and methods, such questions as the united front, policy in the trade unions, estimate of and attitude to the Socialist movement, etc. The very existence of these issues has been greatly hampered by the obstacles placed in the way of frank and comradely discussion of our differences—especially in the light of recent events in this country and on a world scale. And yet we must all agree that only such frank and comradely discussion can lead to real unity in the Communist movement, which we all desire so earnestly. We therefore suggest that a joint committee be set up to encourage and regulate the mutual discussion of the disputed questions. In particular, we would propose the exchange of discussion articles in our papers, joint discussion meetings, etc. Certainly this suggestion should meet with your approval today in view of the broad discussion the Communist International has urged in preparation of the Seventh Congress, a discussion in which Socialist workers and even members of Catholic trade unions are invited to participate.

We make these proposals to you because we are convinced that they would greatly benefit the Communist and labor movements of this country, to the furtherance of which both our organizations are dedicated. The fruitful cooperation that our comrades of the C.P. and C.P.O. have succeeded in establishing in Germany, should be an inspiration and a guide to us in this country. We hope that, putting to one side all narrow factional prejudices and considerations, you will see your way clear to acting favorably upon our proposals, thus greatly advancing the consolidation of the forces of the class-conscious proletariat of this country.

In connection with this appeal, we would suggest that a delegation of our National Committee be permitted to appear before your plenum so as to explain our proposals in greater detail. We take this occasion also to invite a delegation of your plenum to appear before the full session of our National Committee to be held on December 29, 30, and 31 in this city with a view to presenting to us your attitude on our proposals. We may also advise you that a copy of this communication has been sent to the Executive Committee of the Communist International with the request that it use its influence in obtaining the favorable consideration of our proposals by you.

Fraternally,
NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMUNIST PARTY U. S. (OPPOSITION)
JAY LOVESTONE, Secretary

Committee will close on Monday night December 31 (New Year's Eve) with a rousing banquet. A large concert program has been arranged and dancing provided for into the wee hours of the morning. Tickets for the banquet are 60c. and can be secured at C.P.O.

Jay Lovestone

"WHAT NOW IN SOCIALIST PARTY?"
December 23, 8 P. M. — 51 W. 14 St.

Taking Profit out of War Means Preparation for War

The whole nation is expected to stand up and cheer, for Roosevelt has announced his determination to take the profit out of war. Cynical Republican Senators have already raised the cry that it is a political maneuver in order to take the wind out of the sails of the Nye Committee investigating munition manufacturers.

The whole investigation of the munitions industry arose because of the desire on the part of the

military authorities to concentrate the manufacture of munitions into the hands of the government. That this is a war preparedness move is made doubly certain by the haste with which President Roosevelt assures us that "the question of preparedness is not under consideration" and that the investigations and his own cry of taking the profits out of war were not prompted by the "danger of international strife." The recently settled controversy between Jugoslavia and Hungary merely emphasizes the fact that Europe stood upon the very brink of a new world war. The settlement has not removed the causes for this conflict and the postponement of war is of short duration indeed.

Another aspect of Roosevelt's new crusade, throws some light on what we may expect when war comes. "The boys in the trenches," says our very "liberal" President, "got \$1 a day and the boys in the munitions factories got \$5 to \$10 a day." No proposal is made but the implication is clear. Profits from war are to be removed thru the militarization of labor, thru paying labor a soldiers wage. The cries against war profits and the synthetic indignation against the munitions manufacturers will be forgotten under the soothing phrase-mongery of our eloquent President, but what will remain, unless labor prepares now to battle effectively, will be the shackles of military slavery for industrial labor, when war looms.

Perhaps not unrelated to this question, is the proposal of Attorney General Cummings, for the establishment of a Scotland Yard. This is of course being proposed under the flag of an offensive against crime, but class conscious workers who remember the role that the Department of Justice played in 1919-20, will know what to expect from a national Scotland Yard. Under the cry of racketeering and gangsterism, the attack will be directed against the trade unions and other working class organizations. The organizations of the Democratic and Republican parties, the centers of gangsterism and racketeering, will of course be left untouched, for it is upon these that the two party system rests.

Already the cry for the suppression of the communist movement has been raised by the National Manufacturers' Association and Congress will be called upon soon to act on a bill to this effect.

Under the guise of liberalism, the executive powers of the government are being constantly strengthened and new methods worked out for a renewed offensive against the labor movement.

JOIN THE CPO—

JAY LOVESTONE
51 West 14th St.
New York City

Please send information about the CPO to

Name
Address
City

Canadian C.P. Expels Breslow For Unifying Workers' Ranks

The writer of this statement, for years a leading and active member of the Communist Party of Canada, has been expelled from the party for his advocacy of unity with the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. It is this attitude on his part which has called forth a bitter tirade from C.P. ranks.

Comrade Frank B. Breslow is the former manager of the Montreal Dress Cutters Union. Since the affiliation of this union with the I.L.G.W.U. he has been elected manager of the union, now Dress Cutters Union, Local 205.

—Editor

by Frank B. Breslow

In the issues of the Worker and Der Kampf of December 8, two official C.P. of Canada papers, an article was published dealing with the present campaign of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union in Montreal. In this article I am accused of betraying the interests of the cutters and the dressmakers by coming out for affiliation with the International. In this article there is mention made of certain differences between myself and the C.P. during the course of building the Dress Cutters Union and the Industrial Union. There are also a number of slanderous accusations made against me.

In order to clarify the present situation in Montreal amongst the dressmakers, and my differences with the official C.P., it will be necessary for me to write an article on the whole situation. However, in this statement I wish to confine myself merely to answering a number of slanderous accusations and lies which have appeared in a later issue of the Worker, of December 12th. This article I must admit, is a masterpiece and could, no doubt, take first prize in any exhibition of slander and lying. In it there are the following statements made which must be clarified to the workers in Montreal and particularly to the dress cutters:

1. I am being accused of playing a double game and dealing with the leadership of the International; of coming to an understanding with them in so far as my position is concerned, and that then only did I come out for the International. To prove this the writer says that towards the end of a certain meeting of active cutters I left before the meeting was over and was later seen in the company of the International leadership. In answer to this I wish to state the following: Not until a few minutes before the vote was taken, which resulted in a three to one decision for affiliation, did I intimate in any way, my stand to the leadership of the International or even to the executive of the Cutters Union. With regard to the meeting referred to which I left before it was over and after which I was supposed to have plotted with the International leadership to assure myself of a position, by delivering the cutters to them, the incident actually happened as follows: Comically enough it happened to be that instead of meeting the International

leadership, I met no one else but the National Secretary of the Workers Unity League, Comrade Tom Ewen, who happened to be in Montreal at that time and had asked me for some information on the situation.

2. The incident mentioned in the article where I threatened to remove the Executive for applying to the International for a charter without first consulting the membership, happened as follows: At the Executive meeting where the question of affiliation to the International was raised, I stated the following: "I am not going to attempt to convince the members of the Executive whether to affiliate or not to affiliate to the International. However, before any steps are taken in this direction we must call a special meeting to consult the membership and get their decision." When this motion was defeated 10 to 1, I said that should the Executive act without consulting the membership, I would call a general membership meeting and appeal to the membership to have the Executive removed. However, I wish to make it clear that I did not threaten the removal of the Executive because of their being in favor of affiliation and trying to influence the membership accordingly.

3. My remarks, at the special membership meeting where the referendum was taken on the question of craft unionism, were interpreted to mean that I placed my personal interests above the interests of the dressmakers; that had the dressmakers strike culminated in victory, I would be for joining the Industrial Union. In this they are using the same arguments that the bosses used against me in the strike, that the reason why I was for a joint strike was because I wanted to become the czar of the dress industry. The actual facts are as follows: In stating my stand to the membership, I pointed out that the cutters, on the basis of their own experiences, came to the historically proven conclusion that as a craft organization they cannot exist any longer, but that they must affiliate themselves with the rest of the organized needle trades workers; that had the strike been successful and the Industrial Union strengthened with a few thousand members and with power and control in the shops, the cutters would at this time have on the agenda the question of affiliation with the Dressmakers Section of the Industrial Union. However, due to the lost strike and the smashing of both organizations, the sentiment of the cutters is for going to the International, which they see as an established organization of needle trades workers that will be able to assist them in the reorganization of their union and the regaining of their lost conditions.

4. The article further states that throughout the existence of the Montreal Dress Cutters Union I vacillated, that the cutters know how I failed them on many a problem in the shops for the sake of being on good terms with the boss; and that "rank opportu-

ism is the root of my make-up." If this is so why is it that for almost three years this was tolerated and not brought before the attention of the cutters? Wouldn't that be betraying the interests of the dressmakers on their part? However, the cutters know differently as is proven by the support I have.

5. I am further accused of being in "the main responsible for the extreme craft ideology of the Cutters Union." Now let us revert a little to some history of the cutters organization. Immediately after the first general strike of the dress cutters in the Fall of 1933, which was successful, I, together with the leadership of the cutters organization as well as the organizer of the Industrial Union, realized the danger of craftism amongst the cutters and the necessity of taking drastic steps to combat this craft ideology. We proposed to the Party leadership to call a conference of both unions, namely the Cutters Union and the Dressmakers Section of the Industrial Union, with a view of forming an all-inclusive, independent union, a sentiment for which was prevalent amongst many dressmakers, including the cutters. We realized then that the vast majority of the cutters were definitely against such a union as the Industrial Union represents. In answer to this stand we were knocked on the head for such "rank opportunism" and for underestimating the role of "real revolutionary unions" in this period. It is a well-known fact now that due to the mechanical utilization of the cutters, forcing upon them joint action in the shops, the cutters actually did not participate in the last strike, although they did leave their jobs when they were called out. It is against this mechanical approach to the cutters that I have continually fought.

6. The article further states that faced with a difficult situation I could not stand the test, and that as a means of evading "a hard struggle," the loss of a career and perhaps jail, I supposedly stated at one meeting that I don't want to be a martyr anymore. To this I wish to ask: Which means evading the struggle: to follow a sectarian policy and remain isolated from the masses of workers and their struggles, or to actively participate with the masses in their struggles? At the mentioned meeting when I used the term "martyr," I did not mean personal sacrifice, as my past nine years activity in the labour movement has proven that I am capable of personal sacrifices. What I meant, when using this term, was simply that I refused to follow a policy which would lead to a split in the ranks of the cutters organization and complete isolation from them.

7. The article further specializes in slander and lying statements as a substitute for a solution to the problems of the dressmakers. Apparently the leaders of the Industrial Union wish to utilize me as a scapegoat to cover up the intolerable situation which they have created. What do these people propose to do with the cutters? Split away a small group and form a local of the Industrial Union or come in to the International Dress Cutters Local and work to build it up? These people are still wavering. They are still groping in the dark, trying to find the majority sentiment of the cutters, two weeks after the vote for affiliation was taken and with an active campaign already under way. What do they propose to do to bring about unity in this trade?

In conclusion, I wish to place before the dressmakers as well as the needle trades workers in Montreal, my stand fairly and squarely.

1. I am now, as in the past, for a policy of class struggle as against class collaboration.

2. I am for amalgamation of all the needle trades.

3. I am for the fullest democracy of the membership in the union and against expians.

5. I am for a militant, constructive and realistic policy in the daily struggles of the workers and against disruptive actions no matter from what direction they may come.

I may be expelled from the C.P.; nevertheless, it does not mean that I am expelled from the revolu-

WHAT NEXT FOR AMERICAN LABOR?

Hear

B. HERMAN
FRIDAY, DEC. 21, 8 P. M.
Boro Park Labor Lyceum
1377 - 42 St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

BRADLEY'S

For
Breakfast
Lunch
Dinner
or a
Southern
Waffle
at
Midnite
Patronize
Bradley's
Cafeteria

6th Avenue
& 14th Street

WORKERS AGE

Published twice monthly by the
Workers Age Publishing Association

51 West 14th Street
New York City

Vol. 3. No. 22.
December 15, 1934.

Subscription Rates:
\$1.25 per year, 75c for six months.
Foreign Rates:
\$1.50 a year, \$1.00 for six months.

Application for second class entry at the
post-office of New York, N. Y. pending.

4 & 5 Course
LUNCHEON 40 & 50c
6 Course
CHICKEN DINNER 60c
SPECIAL LUNCHEON 35c
SERVED ALL DAY
Spaghetti - Dessert - Coffee 35c
A La Carte All Day
GIUSTI'S
SPAGHETTI INN
WINE AND BEER SERVED
49 WEST 16th STREET
NEW YORK CITY

DELICIOUS FOOD?
GOOD SERVICE?
go to
Field's
RESTAURANT
523 Sixth Avenue
N. Y. C.

New Years Eve BANQUET DANCE AND CONCERT

PAT GLADSTONE
will sing "Deutsche Arbeiter Lieder"

DOLORES CASSILLIA
will render Mexican Peasant Songs

Dancing to the rhythm of the
Harlem Club Valhalla Orchestra

MONDAY, DEC. 31

8 P. M.

IRVING PLAZA HALL
15th St. and Irving Place

Apices:

COMMUNIST PARTY (OPPOSITION)
New York District

Admission
60 Cents

It Sounds Very Familiar

All the quotations printed below are taken from "The Bankruptcy of the American Labor Movement" by William Z. Foster. It is precisely against the theories expressed in these quotations that Foster argued so earnestly and so convincingly. We call the attention of our readers to the striking similarity between the sentiments expressed below and the theories developed by the Communist Party, after 1929, when it entered upon a course of dual unionism.

"The American Federation of Labor is not now and never can become a labor movement."—From the speeches of Vincent St. John.

"The United Mine Workers is a

capitalist organization just as much as the standing army of the United States."—From the speech of James P. Thompson at the Everett, Washington convention of the International Union of Shingle Weavers.

"The 28,000 local unions of the A. F. of L. are 28,000 agencies of the capitalist class."—From the speeches of William D. Haywood.

"When it comes to strike breaking the A. F. of L. has Farley beaten 1,000 ways."—James P. Thompson, Everett, Wash., 1911.

"The American Federation of Labor is neither American, nor a
(Continued on Page 6)

Workers' Democracy or Dictatorship?

On Hook's Revival of Kautsky's Theories

by Will Herberg

In his book, "Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx," Sidney Hook asks: "What doctrine is essential to Marxism in the sense that it can be used as a touchstone of allegiance to his thought? . . . It can be categorically stated that it is Marx's theory of the state which distinguishes the true Marxist from the false." This is a true criterion. And, according to this very criterion, Hook's recent article on "Workers Democracy" in the Modern Monthly of October 1934 shows him to be a thoroughly false Marxist for, in all except superficial phrasology, he breaks with the Marxist theory of the state in its most essential aspects. Judging by this article, it is no longer possible to regard Hook as a Marxist; all his learned and undeniably useful studies of certain aspects of Marxist theory cannot save him, any more than they can Kautsky or Hilferding. He has taken the decisive step.

An Echo Of The Past

"The essence of the Marxist theory (of the state)," Lenin tells us, "is the doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat." It is this which Sidney Hook now rejects, openly as far as the term itself is concerned and covertly with regard to its substance. His arguments are not new, although they seem to have just occurred to him for the first time. They are the well-worn arguments of Kautsky, Paul Levi and Otto Bauer, cast in a somewhat novel form and embellished by Trotskyite venom. And if I examine them in some detail in these paragraphs it is not because they have gained anything in point or significance in the last fifteen years; it is only because they cast a rather curious light upon the Marxist integrity of the chief theoretician of the "new revolutionary party" in the United States, who at the same time modestly regards himself as the only one really "understanding" Marx and the import of his teachings. Sidney Hook avows a marked distaste for the phrase "dictatorship of the proletariat" and "prefers" the term "workers' democracy." Apparently it is not merely a matter of literary taste, about which, of course, there can be no dispute. For Hook suddenly discovers that the phrase "dictatorship of the proletariat" is of little import to Marxism and that only those who suffer "from the fetishism of terminology and from the grip of verbal symbols" will insist upon it. Furthermore, it is only an accidental phrase, so to speak, with Marx himself. "In no public writing," Hook confidently assures us, "does Marx use the expression 'dictatorship of the proletariat.' It occurs only twice in his unpublished manuscripts . . ." Therefore, why insist upon it?

Hook Paraphrases Kautsky

All this has a familiar if somewhat old-fashioned ring. In his pamphlet, *The Proletarian Revolution*, written a little over sixteen years ago, Lenin had to settle accounts with an identically similar argument coming from . . . Kautsky! Lenin wrote:

"How the 'Marxist' Kautsky does it (refers to the dictatorship of the proletariat) is the purest comedy. Listen: This conception 'is based on merely a word of Karl Marx,' that is what he says literally on page 20. And on page 60 he reiterates it in this form: 'Here we recall the phrase of Marx about the dictatorship of the proletariat which he once used in a letter in 1875 . . .'"

"To refer to these famous statements of Marx forming the essence of his whole revolutionary doctrine as a 'phrase' is to heap contempt upon Marxism and to completely repudiate it. These words fall with equal force upon Hook, who apparently does not know that he is only echoing Kautsky somewhat belatedly.

Marx On Dictatorship

Nor should our learned historian be so careless with his facts. Marx

does use the expression 'dictatorship of the proletariat' in a 'public writing' and in a very significant way too. In the first part of *Class Struggles in France*, Marx writes:

"Only their (the workers) defeat convinced them of the truth that the slightest improvement of their conditions remains a utopia within the bourgeois republic, a utopia which becomes a crime when it seeks realization. In places of form but petty and even bourgeois in essence . . . came the bold revolutionary watchword: Overthrow of the bourgeoisie! Dictatorship of the Proletariat."

And in the third part of the same work he repeats:

"The proletariat groups itself more and more around revolutionary Socialism, around Communism. . . This Socialism is the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary transition towards the abolition of class divisions as such . . ."

And in June 1850 Marx and Engels signed a very "public writing," the statutes of the World League of Revolutionary Communists, (the fusion of the Communist League with a wing of the French Blanquists), which begins:

"The aim of the union is the overthrow of all privileged classes, their subjection to the dictatorship of the proletariat in which the revolution is maintained in permanence up to the realization of communism. . ."

Can it be that Professor Hook has not consulted his sources?

As a matter of fact, as Lenin shows, if there is a single concept, a single expression that recurs at every stage of the development of Marx's thought, from 1850 to 1880, it is the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat! Marx himself emphasizes the significance of this conception. "My contribution," Marx wrote in 1852 in a letter to Weydemeyer, "has been to prove . . . that the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat and that this dictatorship is itself only a transition to the ultimate abolition of all classes and to a society without classes." To dismiss the whole matter as cavalierly as does Hook, is not simply the result of ignorance, which would not be so serious. As the case of Kautsky shows us, it goes far deeper; it means the rejection of the substance, the content, of the phrase, that is, the very essence of Marx's revolutionary teachings!

Dictatorship Of A Party

Hook launches his attack on the Marxist doctrine of the state along two lines: first, by whittling down the dictatorship of the proletariat to nothing thru contrasting it with "dictatorship of the party" and, secondly, by making an open plea for a many-party system under the soviet regime. Let us examine the nature and implications of these arguments.

In the first place it should be noted that here too there is nothing new. Is there any difference except that they are formulated in a much inferior manner, between Hook's arguments against the "dictatorship of the party" and the diatribes of the German Left Communists of 1920 whom Lenin annihilated so effectively in the fifth chapter of his pamphlet on Left Communism or those with which Paul Levi warred against Bolshevism for so many years? No; the family resemblance is unmistakable.

Revolutionary Marxists, following the teachings of Marx and Lenin, have always maintained

* Reading like an echo of the dead past, like a fossilized work, so to speak, the incredible article of Paul Mattick in the December 1934 issue of the MODERN MONTHLY presents the viewpoint of the old German ultra-lefts so uncomfortably close to Sidney Hook's contentions on all main points.

that the dictatorship of the proletariat is possible only if it is exercised thru the Communist Party. Sidney Hook is positively shocked at this conception, which he does not hesitate to brand as "tyranny" and "usurpation."

That it is natural for the Communist Party, which has led the revolution and whose program is being realized by the soviet state, to be the directing and leading force in the workers government, is admitted by Hook. That the Communists should act together inside the soviet bodies and outside so as to spread their views among the masses and secure the election of those candidates who support these views, goes without saying, altho Hook seems to have his reservations even on this point, for he refers sneeringly to the "formulations of soviet line already in party camera" (party caucus, in English). That the Communists should use all the resources at their command, including the resources of the soviet state, to advance their program, is surely no more than elementary political common sense. But together this adds up to that awful "dictatorship of the party" which throws Hook into a fit of indignation every time he thinks of it.

Relations of Party And Class

Altho he does not succeed in expressing it very clearly, Hook has something else in mind in berating the "dictatorship of the party" and that something is the essential Marxist conception of the revolutionary workers party and its relation to the working class.

"Interest," says Hook, "is at the heart of policy and any policy which affects the working class as a whole must express the interests of the working class as it conceives them and not as a minority political party thinks it should conceive them."

Let the reader ponder these words carefully, for in essence they are an outright repudiation of Marxism.

"Nothing has been more odious to the ears of a Marxist than the traditional claim that a certain ruling group is a better judge of the interests of the people than they are themselves."

Is it true that the "working class as a whole" is always a better judge of its interests than a "minority political party"? The "working class as a whole" was overwhelmingly in favor of the imperialist war in 1917, of Harding in 1920 and Roosevelt in 1932. What is a good judge of its own interests then? Who was the better judge of the interests of the workers, the masses of the workers themselves or the handful of revolutionary Marxists? "A policy which affects the whole working class must express the interests of the working class as it conceives them," Hook teaches us. In 1917 a "true working class policy" is a la Hook would have been wildly jingoistic; in 1920 it would have rallied behind "normalcy"; in 1932, behind the "New Deal." Because after all, that was the way the "working class as a whole" conceived its own interests!

Is it not clear that this grotesque worship of the "working class as a whole" is only a "revolutionary" cover for the grossest opportunism?

"The confounding of these two conceptions of party and class," Lenin wrote in the theses on the role of the Communist Party in the proletarian revolution, presented to the second congress of the Communist International in 1920, "can only lead to the greatest errors and confusion. Thus, for instance, it is clear that, notwithstanding the disposition or prejudices of certain parts of the working masses during the imperialist war, the workers

party ought to have resisted these prejudices, defending the historical interests of the proletariat. . . The duty of the workers' parties should have been to combat such an attitude of the majority of the workers and to defend the interests of the workers at whatever cost."

Evidently Lenin did not believe that the real interests of the workers were what the workers themselves conceived them to be. He believed that a "minority political party" knew what these interests were far better than the workers themselves!

And so must everyone who has the least idea of what a revolutionary workers party really is. "The Communists," Marx declared in the Communist Manifesto, ". . . stress and bring to the fore the common interests of the entire proletariat. . . They continually represent the interests of the whole movement." Hook quotes this passage but does not understand it.

If it means anything at all, it means that the revolutionary workers party, just because it is the bearer of Marxist theory, understands the real interests of the workers far better than the backward and socially unconscious bourgeois-minded workers themselves. In fact, the program of the revolutionary workers party is in essence the expression of the real interests of the workers, even tho this party may be a tiny minority and the workers may scorn and persecute it. This is the most elementary Marxism.

Hook's Democratic Fetishism

Hook's entire viewpoint is the crudest sort of democratic fetishism disguised in a Marxist mantle. The ordinary petty bourgeois democratic philistine declaims: "The voice of the people is the voice of God." Hook is a little more sophisticated: "The voice of the 'working class as a whole' is the voice of God." Just as the petty bourgeois democrat converts the word "people" into a holy fetish, so does Hook do with the word "working class"—and with the same results.

The truth is that Hook betrays not the slightest understanding of the concrete situation under which the proletarian dictatorship takes place; he contents himself with manipulating abstract concepts. Never once does he approach the world of reality and its problems—the position of the proletariat in the midst of the non-proletarian toiling masses, the ideological heterogeneity of the proletariat and the relation of the party to it, and so on. Everything is settled for him by the magic formula of democracy.

But, it may be objected, all this may be quite true in capitalist society where the masses of the workers are under bourgeois influence; naturally they don't know their own interests. After the revolution, however, things are different; the workers are already class conscious and understand their own interests quite well! Unfortunately the "revolution" is no wonder-working miracle transforming mankind overnight. No one knew this better than Lenin and no one took greater pains to emphasize it. Of course, a successful revolution presupposes a high degree of class consciousness among decisive sections of the proletariat; indeed, the acceptance of the program and leadership of the revolutionary Marxist party is the best sign of this. But the spiritual influences of capitalism continue active long after the overthrow of the bourgeois state.

"They (the petty bourgeoisie) surround the proletariat on every side with a petty bourgeois atmosphere," Lenin wrote (in the fifth chapter of his pamphlet on Left Communism), describing conditions after the revolution, "impregnating the proletariat, corrupting and demoralizing it, causing it to relapse into petty bourgeois characterlessness, demoralization,

individualism and vacillation between moods of exaltation and dejection."

And, as long as this continues to be the case, the Marxist vanguard of the proletariat is still a better judge of the real interests of the class than the "working class as a whole." Will Sidney Hook challenge this?

Relations of Party To Soviet State

With the air of one presenting a positively devastating argument, Hook demands an answer to the question: "Suppose there is a conflict of opinion between the soviet and the party—what then? Who submits to whom?" And he scores an easy victory because Max Schachtman, whom he quite gratuitously selects as his opponent, replies after a little evasion, "The party would submit and seek to convince the soviet."

But the matter is not quite so simple nor is the answer quite so categorical. It depends on time, place and circumstance! One thing is certain: If the soviet opposes any essential phase of the program of the Marxist party, this is a sign that non-proletarian influences are making themselves felt among the workers and their representatives—by which I don't at all mean deliberate counter-revolutionary propaganda but rather the effects of the "petty bourgeois atmosphere" alluded to by Lenin. The real interests of the workers are reflected in the program of the party far more truly than in the views of the soviet majority at any particular time. Surely this is plain enough. What the party should do in the case of a conflict is not a matter of fixed principle but rather of high expediency. Of course, in the general run of such cases, if we may speak in such terms of an occurrence so very rare in its nature, the party gives way to the soviet—not because the soviet viewpoint is nearer to the interests of the workers than the party position but because the soviet system provides an effective mechanism for making the party viewpoint prevail thru convincing the workers. Indeed the fundamental significance of the soviet system lies precisely in the fact that, thru it, the historical interests of the proletariat, as expressed in the Marxist program, become the active will of the masses.

Fundamentally it is a question of whether, from the point of view of the ultimate interests of the revolution, it is more expedient to make a concession to non-proletarian influences or to challenge the soviet majority in the name of the real interests of the proletariat! This is utterly different from the dilemma posed by Sidney Hook.

But the conflict may touch interests serious enough to admit no concession. In 1921, the regularly elected soviet of Kronstadt came into violent conflict with the party, rejected its program and ousted its representatives. It raised the slogan: "Soviets without Bolsheviks." What did the party do? Did it exclaim: "Well, democracy is democracy. The Kronstadt workers and sailors know their own interests better than we do. After all, we're only a minority party!" Nonsense! For behind the "netty bourgeois characterlessness, demoralization and individualism" of the Kronstadt soviet stood . . . the armed counter-revolution. The party mobilized the labor organizations supporting it and suppressed the Kronstadt rebellion by force of arms. And I presume Sidney Hook approved that procedure then and approves it now. But how about "democracy"? What right did Lenin have to tell the Kronstadt workers what was good for them? They knew their interests better than any "minority party" didn't they? Let Sidney Hook figure that out!

The fact is that, with his devastating question, Sidney Hook devastates nobody but himself. For he deliberately poses the question as a choice between the form of democracy and the substance of the proletarian dictatorship and he

(Continued on Page 8)

The Socialist Party - A Circus on Fire

Boston Decisions Show Political Paralysis

by Jay Lovestone

Out of the welter of confusion and chaos gripping the sessions of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party one definite fact stands out strikingly: The Centralist "new" leadership of the Socialist Party, anemic at its birth, has become paralyzed. Its paralysis was brought about by a virile Right Wing term, which has only begun to ravage the Thomas leadership.

Centering around the frankly reformist clique, gathered in the New York State Executive Committee, headed by Louis Waldman, the Right Wing of the SP has made tremendous headway towards ideological hegemony in recent months. Under the impact of the blows struck by the Waldman-Oneal faction (The Jewish Daily Forward Corporation and its feeble English expression, The New Leader) the NEC, at its Boston meeting, took steps to undo much of what has happened, to counteract sharply, if not consistently, the leftward developments in the SP during the last year.

Right Wing Scores

It is true that Abe Cahan, James Oneal & Company did not get all they asked for in their memorandum; it is equally true they never expected to get everything at one stroke. That would be too "revolutionary" even for these museum-pieces of American reformism! These hoary solons of pure-and-simple, open social reformism, of putrid opportunism, really didn't expect to get even as much as they got. This is true despite their ravings and their howling chorus of dissatisfaction with the decisions of the last National Committee sessions. Surely, they are not such semi-skilled politicians as to have expected the NEC to take steps to change its composition so as to shift the center of gravity, and subsequently the majority, in their direction, after the handsome trouncing they received at Detroit last June. Certainly only a super-annuated simpleton could believe that Thomas and his wobbly friends would throw away even their reserve crutches and allow a sort of local option system

to be introduced into the SP. So naive Hoan and Kreuger are not as to allow the Declaration of Principles to be applicable below the Mason and Dixon line and lynchable east of Hoboken. Likewise, no one should take seriously the glycerine tears of the Jewish Daily Forward's artistic staff (Dr. Hendin and other touted goldsmiths) when it weeps over the failure to remove Senior as national secretary. This demand of attorney Waldman and his recently La Guardia-elevated partner, Judge Panken, was not made in earnest; it was made only as a maneuver to throw mud at Senior and as a first painful in the campaign to sink him. As such it succeeded. The whitewash itself proved it.

The United Front—The Acid Test

In what way can it be said that the Right Wing of the SP has pushed the Committee, has pushed the Party, to the Right? One must examine the political decisions of the NEC to find the answer to this question. The decisive question agitating the international Socialist movement today is the problem of the united front or unity of action between the Socialist and Communist Parties against the menace of Fascism and capitalist reaction. This is the dividing line between Right and Left in the Executive Committee of the Second International. This is the boundary line demarcating the sphere of Parties moving leftward and the sphere of Parties either stagnating or moving rightward in the world Socialist movement. Thus the British Labor Party, the Dutch Socialist Party, and the Scandinavian sections of the Socialist and Labor International are continuing their bitter hostility to all moves in the direction of a united front with the Communist International and its sections. Thus the Spanish, French, and Austrian Parties are moving leftward in the Second International as indicated

by their advocacy of a united front with the Comintern and its various parties.

It is significant that the SP of the U.S., whose delegation at the last International Conference of the LSI was in the forefront for united action with the Communist Parties, has now made a turn backward. While the Second International Executive has retreated from its outright opposition to a united front with the Communist International, this American vanguard of yesterday's Left is now in the foreground of the Right. State organizations which are in favor of united front actions with the Communist Party can go ahead. State organizations which are opposed can continue their opposition. State organizations which are in doubt can enjoy the pleasure of continuous, fruitless meditation. Well, whatever else you may say about this decision of the NEC, it is not bogus democracy, but genuinely impotent democracy, the democracy of Socialist Party paralysis. The SP is today a sort of liberal jiu-jitsu puzzle, the key to which is to be found in the political geography of the forty-eight states.

Thomas Is Against "Companionate Marriage"

Even the merest tyro in politics knows that if the united front with the Communists is to mean anything at all, it has to be directed and stimulated from the center on a nation-wide scale. This is vital, particularly because of the years of opposition to the united front by both the Socialist and Communist Parties; this is imperative precisely because of the vigorous resistance to the united front by the battery of lawyers passing judgment on socialist policies in New York State. Norman Thomas hastens to tell the real meaning of the neither-here nor-there decision of the NEC in his letter to the New York Times

of December 8, 1934. Thomas tells the world that he, as the leader of the party, has refused to officiate at such marriage ceremonies between the SP and the Communist organizations. He states: "I have never even proposed 'local companionate marriage' . . . The National Executive Committee at its last meeting definitely ended all talk of united front negotiations with the Communist Party. It did, however, permit state committees to approve emergency joint action if they so desire. These emergency actions are not equivalent to state united fronts."

This accounts for the rejection by the NEC of the specific proposals for a united front, for joint action, made by the Communist Party Opposition. The NEC decided to stick to its Labor resolution of the Detroit Convention which provides for open and apologetic for illicit coquetting with and kow-towing to the corrupt bureaucracy in the trade unions. The NEC turned down our proposals for taking steps towards an effective labor defence organization, towards a broad anti-Fascist movement, towards a genuine labor party development.

A Right Wing Lie Is Exposed

We do not find it necessary to go into details of what and how things transpired during the forty-odd minutes accorded to the CPO delegation at the Boston NEC sessions. We are planning to publish the stenogram of this session upon our receipt of the same, as officially promised us by the NEC. But at this point, it is entirely in place to state that Dr. Hendin lied outright from beginning to end, when he wrote in the columns of his jaundiced sheet that the CPO delegation said its organization voted the Socialist ticket in the last elections. It is just the opposite of what we said. We categorically stated that because of full agreement in principle between us and the CP we have voted in the last elections and in previous elections for CP candidates. It is significant that the Freiheit, official Jewish organ of the Communist Party, hastened to reprint this yellow Forward yarn. Not even the New Leader, which has recently even more than in the past, become an English edition of the Jewish Forward, dared lie so shamefully. William M. Feigenbaum, reporting the Boston sessions of the NEC in the New Leader of December 8, 1934 said on this point: "In reply to another question he, (Lovestone) said his Party had voted for the Communist candidates at the election."

C.P. Acrobatics Towards The Freiheit Party

The Freiheit incident is merely an index of the unprincipledness and stupidity pervading the official Communist Party tactics towards the Socialist Party and its members, particularly in the last couple of years. On February 15, 1934 The Daily Worker boasted editorially that: "The CP did not wait to negotiate with reformist leaders." In early September Minor raved and ranted before the NEC of the SP, with tears streaming down the furrows of his face, begging for a united front with Thomas, Oneal, and their colleagues. On April 14 Earl Browder, the not-yet-unfrosted cardinal of the CP, hurled a message from on high, a sort of a papal encyclical, to the Eighth Convention of the CP, against the Revolutionary Policy Committee. Proclaimed Browder:

"The composition of this left wing, however, gives little ground for expecting it to lead the real leftward development of SP workers towards the united front with the Communists and eventually towards unification . . . In all probability this effort (RPC) will also collapse into another contribution to that 'left' social fascism, whose object is to disperse and

disrupt the leftward movement of the workers."

But on December 10, 1934, after the CP bamboozled some RPC members into some sort of a fraudulent united front from below, the Daily Worker directs its "devastating" broadside against Norman Thomas—this time in behalf of the RPC as follows:

" . . . The membership overwhelmingly adopted the declaration of principles, which despite its confusion and basic omissions on important questions, was an expression of the increasingly leftward trend in the Socialist Party . . . The truly revolutionary forces in the party and the RPC will be 'constructively' expelled."

What the CP will say next no one knows, least of all the puppet leadership now infesting the highest councils of the American section of the Communist International.

Expell The R.P.C. Demands Right Wing

One small matter is pertinent at this point. Gitlow, Zam and their one-sixth of a baker's dozen, thru their entry into the SP, have become a small, but scurrious force for the Right. This is always the case with those who are converted backwards. These little Socialists have attached themselves to the right wing section of the so-called militants for a merciless war on the Revolutionary Policy Committee. They are applauding the decision of the NEC providing for the expulsion of the Revolutionary Policy Committee because of its recognition of the historical inevitability of armed insurrection in the proletarian revolution.

Incidentally, it is of no small import that the resolution against the RPC adopted by the NEC was sponsored by Oneal on behalf of the right wing thruout the party. The real enemy of Oneal and Cahan is not the Thomas-Hoan alliance; it is the RPC with its advocacy of revolutionary socialism. It is unfortunate that the wavering, hesitation, and lack of distinct ideological separation by the RPC from the self-styled militants, who are now being driven to the right in panic, will undoubtedly play into the hands of Waldman & Co. In this sense, the RPC made an almost suicidal error when some of its outstanding figures in the South, inclusive even of its national secretary, monkeyed around with the typical good-for-nothing united front from below concoctions of the CP. Such missteps, regardless of the nobility of their intentions or the enthusiasm of their takers, objectively play right into the hands of the extreme reformists in the SP. Immediately after this, Waldman's legal talent on the New York State Executive Committee was set into motion to propose the next inevitable step flowing out of the NEC decision against the RPC; that is, to expel all RPC members from the SP of the Empire State. The RPC will now pay dearly for its weak and unclear attitude towards the Thomas militants, which means towards the no-militants. The fine fight put up particularly by Powers Hanrood at the NEC sessions for leftward policies should, however, serve to stimulate the genuine revolutionary forces in the SP. For the RPC, it is not at all too late to learn. Only sharp clash with all those who oppose its revolutionary principles can serve to strengthen the revolutionary forces in the SP.

The CPO has nothing to hide about its attitude towards developments in the SP. We have no faction interest in the matter; we are not concerned with petty maneuvers; we do not resort to characterless right-about-face unprincipled tactics. In the interest of the working class of this country we would like to see as many socialist workers as possible embrace revolutionary socialism, that is, the principles of Communism. And what we would like to see in behalf of the working class, we work for untiringly and with the highest proletarian devotion.

Something New Under Southern Sun

by Bertram D. Wolfe

I have often been in the South before but the circumstances involved in attending an interracial conference brought home with peculiar intensity the workings of the "Jim Crow" laws.

The conference on Social and Economic Aspects of the Race Problem was held over the Thanksgiving week-end in Raleigh, North Carolina, a typical capitol of the Old South. The park surrounding the capitol building has a small monument to the soldiers who died in the Spanish-American War, a slightly larger one to the victims of the World War and a towering shaft that overawes all monuments, dedicated "To Our Confederate Dead."

White And Colored Water

The drinking fountain bubblers are labelled "colored" water and "white" water respectively. I had to go around the backway at the railroad station at Greensboro or a Negro delegate accompanying me would have been obliged to leave me when I entered the "white entrance." After a late session we trudged half way across town to a poor Negro section to get a cup of coffee, for while whites may violate the Jim Crow laws (not without loss of "caste") by entering a "colored" restaurant, Negroes may not enter a "white restaurant" without subjecting themselves to arrest and even endangering their lives—except of course, if they enter to serve the patrons or sweep and scrub floors.

A school for Negroes, Shaw University, was selected for the conference, for the Negro delegates could not have entered into any regular "white meeting place". In order that the delegates might

be together constantly, we slept and ate together at the University. This in itself was enough to make the conference unique—for with the exception of one "Damyan" (the writer) all the white delegates as well as the Negroes were of Southern birth; and Southern whites sitting at table and sharing dormitories with Negroes, is a phenomenon that flies in the face of the entire structure of Southern society.

Soak The Poor

Imbedded in the favorable matrix of race oppression are ample evidences of the worst class oppression in the country. The miserable segregated schools for Negroes in eleven states (and this was before the depression) were costing \$12.57 per annum for each Negro pupil, and \$44.31 per annum for each white pupil. But in the country as a whole the average was \$99 per pupil! Wages in the South show similar relative differentials as compared with the country as a whole. Relief in North Carolina for Negro families reaches the magnificent figure of \$1.00 a week! And of course, the State has a sales tax of 3% on everything, even elementary necessities. On purchases under 30c. in value, that is the purchases of the very poor, the tax percentage actually rises, for on any purchase between 10 and 30c. in value one pays a full cent tax, so that the tax on a series of 10c. purchases would be 10c. instead of three. Thus the tax, in violation even of the teachings of bourgeois economics text books, is based on "in-

ability to pay."

Denied The Right To Live

The New Deal has put the finishing touches on the raw deal for the Southern Negro. Thruout the South the slogan is being raised: "No jobs for Negroes while a single white man is out of a job!" Just before I arrived the swanky Hotel Sir Walter, at Raleigh, fired its entire staff of colored bell-boys, waitresses and maids, and replaced them with white employees. The same phenomenon crops up everywhere. It is small comfort to the Negroes to think that in the long run this is breaking down a caste distinction between Negro and Poor White as to "menial work," for the phenomenon represents an attempt to drive the Negro out of economic life altogether, a threat to his very existence!

It was in such surroundings and in such an atmosphere that the Conference on Social and Economic Aspects of the Race Problem met to consider the grave questions facing Negro and poor white worker and farmer in the South and to contribute in some measure to their solution. The mere fact of such a conference in the South was something new under the Southern sun, and the character of its discussions and decisions even more so. But that will be the subject of the next article.

* It is symbolic of the situation in the South that when the present president, William Stuart Nelson, a Negro, was elected head of the Shaw University to replace a white president, the Baptist Church Foundation withdrew its financial support from this colored Baptist university.

The Communist Party and Trade Unions

Analyzing Some Recent C. P. Changes

by George F. Miles

Is the trade union line of the Communist International and the C.P.U.S.A. changing? Did Lovestone and his supporters, while in the leadership of the Communist Party, initiate the dual union policy? What is the theoretical premise for the simultaneous liquidation of some industrial unions and the organization of others. These are some of the questions which the would-be trade union expert of the C.P., Jack Stachel, attempts to answer in recent articles. (Daily Worker, October 12 and Communist, November, 1934).

Apparently the attitude of disdainful silence on questions we have raised has been found to be unsatisfactory in the face of the disastrous collapse of the painfully constructed theories of dual unionism. Even though the discussion with us is one of the most scandalous distortion of our position and of patent falsification of the C.P. position, we welcome it nevertheless. It offers the possibility of coming to grips with a policy which has wrought untold harm to the trade union movement and to the Communist Party itself.

Is There Or Is There Not A Change?

Comrade Stachel boils with indignation at the audacity of these "renegades" who claim that the line of the C.I. and to a lesser degree also the American Party is undergoing a change. That, says Stachel, is a "Tammany maneuver" to cover up our own bankruptcy. The burden of his song then, appears to be that there has been no change whatever and that we have drawn upon our imagination when we state otherwise. In the interest of brevity we omit a detailed discussion of the fundamental changes in trade union tactics as seen in Germany, where the C.P.G. has finally accepted the position of the "despicable Brandlerites" for organizing non-partisan, illegal trade unions; in France where the C.P. is prepared to merge its revolutionary trade union center (C.G.T.U.) with the reformist C.G.T.; in Austria and Poland where similar developments have taken place.

We cannot refrain, however, from giving some quotations from Stachel's own articles:

"In this connection we have first to determine where and to what extent we have to change our tactics" (on the trade unions)

"I want to deal mainly with the question of our trade-union policy, where and to what degree we have made and must modify our tactics..." (in the trade unions)

"In the recent year or year and a half we have (very often with great hesitation, as in the mining field) changed our tactics..."

"This, as we have already indicated, is the reason for our present policy of putting main emphasis on work in the A. F. of L."

These quotations are all taken from one article in the November Communist. Despite all cries of the "bankruptcy" of the Lovestones, life itself is forcing the C.P. to undertake certain changes of line. When Stachel speaks of the "present policy" of main emphasis in the A. F. of L. it is clear that there must have been a previous policy of main emphasis elsewhere and that the "present policy" is a new policy. We can easily understand and even sympathize with Stachel's sensitive reaction to the term "change of line," but it is still that regardless of what other label one may attach to it.

"We Change With Changing Conditions"

How to explain away these changes without losing face? The solution was found in the formula of "changing conditions" by which it is proved to all who are sufficiently glib to accept it, that it is not the trade union line

that was wrong but the changing conditions which necessitate changes of line. But this completely fails of its purpose in that it does not explain why the C.P. was so uniformly wrong in its estimate of objective conditions. Why was it that the C.P. could develop the theory that the A. F. of L. could never grow again, that it was bankrupt and that therefore a new revolutionary trade unionism was necessary? To answer by claiming that history gave them a shabby deal is to expose themselves as politically bankrupt.

The Comintern, echoed by the various C.P.'s, insisted in 1928 (before the crisis) that the radicalization of the working class was so deep and widespread, that the trade unions had merged with the capitalist state apparatus and were no longer instruments of the working class and that therefore the time had come for the organization of dual revolutionary unions. Today, after 5 years of deepest crises, when radicalization of the working class is on the increase, the C.P. proposes the "present policy" of main emphasis on the A. F. of L., which they had declared dead and buried in 1928.

"The Fifth Congress," (R.I.L.U.) says, "Lozovsky, decided to withdraw the slogan 'join the reformist unions'" (Communist International, Volume VII, No. 12). Today the revolutionary industrial unions in textile, mining and needle trades have returned to the reformist unions. In the negotiations between the Brooklyn Alteration Painters (T.U.U.L.) and the A. F. of L. for readmission, the former pledged to urge, at a mass meeting, that all unorganized join the A. F. of L. (the reformist unions). Is anything more needed to prove the utter collapse of dual-unionism as a system?

Was The C.P. For Dual-Unionism?

But comrade Stachel denies vigorously that the C.P. ever supported dual unionism as a general policy. In fact Stachel shows extreme sensitiveness to even the term 'dual unionism' and refers to the unions organized by the C.P. as 'parallel unions'. We are not going to argue about names, the question is: how did these come to be? In the Daily Worker of January 6, 1934, Stachel says:

"The TUUL unions did not arise out of the fact that we no longer wished to carry on work to win the workers in the A. F. of L. for the class struggle program. They arose out of the mass expulsions of hundreds of thousands..."

And in the report to the Central Committee (Communist, Nov. 1934) we are told that...

"Only where the masses were largely unorganized or where we could not conduct struggles thru the old unions, did we attempt to build new unions."

With these quotations Stachel attempts to prove conclusively that the C.P. never went in for "parallel unionism" as a general policy. We doubt however, that Stachel convinced either himself or the Central Committee, for these post-natal distortions, to suit the present line, fly in the face of the loudly proclaimed policies of the R.I.L.U. This, Stachel appears to have foreseen for he deliberately hies away from any mention of the R.I.L.U. in his rather windy report to the Central Committee.

It is unfortunate for comrade Stachel that the documents of the Comintern and R.I.L.U. are public property, for they serve very well to give the lie to comrade Stachel.

"The reformist unions are daily becoming more and more openly 'cab organizations,'" wrote comrade Lozovsky in November 1928

(The Red International of Labour Unions, Vol 1, No. 2). And the Tenth Plenum of the Communist International adopted a thesis on the reports of Thaelmann and Lozovsky, in which it is said:

"Already the Sixth Congress

of the Comintern and the Fourth Congress of the R.I.L.U. have recorded the fusion of the reformist trade union apparatus with the bourgeois state and with the large monopoly capitalist enterprises. During the last year, in connection with the unfolding of the class conflicts, this process has gone still deeper." (Inprecor, Vol. 9, No. 46).

This sounds somewhat different than Stachel's explanations. Such a characterization of the trade unions supplies the basis for the building of "parallel" unions not in any one industry as Stachel would have us believe but all along the line.

The Communist International was quite explicit in its meaning when it declared: "The Fifth Congress (R.I.L.U.) passed a resolution in the spirit of the Eleventh Plenum E.C.C.I., on the creation of parallel red trade unions..." (The Communist International, Vol. VII No. 12). In order to make doubly sure that this meant not in any one industry but on a national scale the resolution of the Fifth R.I.L.U. Congress goes on to say:

"It is already necessary to work consistently, consciously and untiringly for the organization of an independent revolutionary trade union movement..." (emphasis mine—GFM).

Perhaps comrade Stachel will claim that this did not apply to the United States, for some "exceptional" reasons. In that case we must remind him that one of the organizers of the Trade Union

Unity League, John J. Ballam, justified the organization of the TUUL on the grounds that:

"The A. F. of L. unions today have been transformed into a part of the strike-breaking machinery of the capitalist state and a section of the employers' organizations." — (Communist April 1929).

In these words Ballam was merely echoing the general line of the C.I. and the R.I.L.U. and was also expressing accurately the position of the C.P.U.S.A. which declared in the Theses of the Seventh Party Convention (1930) "the A. F. of L. is outright fascist".

From such theoretical premises he only logical conclusions were those of the R.I.L.U. Comrade Foster accepted these conclusions and announced to the world in the Communist of October 1933 that

"Our line is to build independent revolutionary unions and to combine them into a new trade union center."

In the light of these facts what becomes of Stachel's carefully concocted story on the origin of the TUUL unions? It stands exposed for what it is—a pure fabrication to cover up the openly dual unionist line of the C.P.

What Is The Line Of The C.P. Today?

That these fabrications cover a change in a desired direction, we appreciate and welcome but we insist that the manner in which it is done vitiates the purpose. Nor can this process of reorientation mature if it continues to be grounded on the discredited dual unionist theories, which even Stachel finds so difficult to defend.

Unlike the Trotskyist Workers Party, which sheds bitter tears over the liquidation of some of the TUUL unions, we say we welcome this act of the party and urge the speedy completion of this process. But when we say that we have not said all. We must ask what will you do in the reformist trade unions? If you still insist that the A. F. of L. is "fascist" and a "section of the employers' organizations" then your purpose can be only one—to destroy the unions. If this be your line then the change in policy is one of merely transferring the destructive virus of dual unionism into the very heart of the trade union movement. Your silence on this most important question is a damning indictment of your line.

There must be many members of the C.P. who are tired of this thankless task of pouring water on the parched Sahara of sectarianism. To these we say, cut thru this maze of phrase mongery with which the Stachels handle the trade union question. Strike against dual unionism at its very roots—by demanding a repudiation of the theories underlying the dual unionist course. Insist that this repudiation be made as openly and frankly as was the policy of dual unionism some years back. This must be done if the character of the C.P.'s work in the trade unions is to change from its present anti-union and destructive role to one of constructive and militant struggle for the conquest of the trade unions.

In the next article we will take up Stachel's claim that the former leadership of the C.P. (Lovestone etc.) initiated the dual unionist line.

Union Developments in Montreal

by Jack Holtzman

It seems that the Montreal Clockmakers have definitely passed out of the stage of seasonal unionism. All previous organization campaigns and strikes, although partially successful, never resulted in the establishment of a permanent organization. The last organization campaign proved to be the most successful the clockmakers had ever experienced.

Determined to avoid the errors of former campaigns, the progressives insisted that the keynote for rallying the support of the clockmakers, be the enforcement of better conditions. As such demands they considered the 40 hour week and minimum wage scales. These preparations proved to be successful. Improvements were obtained in many shops and even many right wingers wholeheartedly supported this drive. The union grew in strength and influence and the prospects for the general strike were favorable.

Local Leadership Plays Conciliatory Role

Instead of utilizing this favorable position to strike and strike hard, the manager of the local entered into protracted negotiations with the employers, lasting a week. In the meanwhile, the workers who were ready and willing to respond, were told every day that the strike is postponed. The result was extremely harmful. Disappointment and skepticism crept into the ranks of the clockmakers.

The text of the agreement arrived at in these conferences, was placed before a special general membership meeting. The provisions of this agreement were considerably lower than the demands originally proposed. Discussion was stifled, after two progressives criticized the agreement, and a vote was hurriedly taken.

Local Leadership Fights Militancy

Two days later, at a mass meeting where the strike was officially declared in order to organize the balance of the trade, six active progressives were declared

suspended from the strike committee and other responsible offices in the union. No official charges were made against them and no opportunity given to answer any charges.

Upon the return of the clockmakers to work it became clear that the agreement was not based on the minimum wage scales and that the leadership had no intention of enforcing it. As our manager stated before a meeting of operators: "the agreement is only for public opinion". Despite the shortcomings of this agreement, considerable improvements in conditions were possible, if it were enforced. This the progressives proposed in a leaflet issued to the workers. The same leaflet also called for the recall of the suspensions. The answer of the leadership was an additional suspension for distributing this leaflet.

Contrary to all expectations the season proved to be a very poor one and extensive efforts at enforcing the agreement did not materialize. The encouraging factor in this situation was the stand of the clockmakers in the shops which made possible improvements of conditions. Wage cuts were rejected, division of work was enforced and despite the slackness of the season, few were out of jobs.

The Defeat Of The Progressives.

The operators local (No. 43) was considered as the stronghold of the progressives. In the recent elections, however, the progressives polled but one third of a rather small total vote. That the suspensions weakened the progressives is of course true, but despite that we must admit that the results were not satisfactory.

The decisive factor for the defeat of the progressives is its failure to differentiate itself openly and clearly from the "lefts", with whom they had been working in one group. The progressives always pursued a realistic, militant

policy and constructively criticized the defects of the union. The "lefts" halfheartedly supported this constructive policy but never failed to exaggerate and engage in unfounded criticism. The clockmakers, who are painfully building their union, reacted against both and defeated the progressives.

The decision of the G.E.B. to organize the Montreal dressmakers places the question of dual unionism in the forefront. The progressives and "lefts" are definitely split on this issue. This question will not only be discussed among the dressmakers but will have to be fought to a finish.

The Dressmakers And The Industrial Union

The Montreal dressmakers have been fighting hard, during the last five years, to build a union. Being the largest group (10,000) among the needle trades and beset by specific difficulties, the task of organization is tremendous. Up to the time of the G.E.B. decision the Industrial Union was the only organization that tried to organize them.

All-Embracing Or "Red" Unions

With the ultra-left turn of the Communist Party some years ago, the policy of the Industrial Union was changed accordingly. The dress cutters refused to join the Industrial Union and organized themselves independently. The cutters, after some hard struggles, succeeded in winning conditions and organizing some 500 of the 600 cutters in the trade. This union too independent was under C.P. influence and helped the Industrial Union considerably.

Some time ago the cutters started a movement for merging both unions into an independent dressmakers union. This, the leaders of the Industrial objected to, preferring a weak but "red" union to a strong but independent union.

Isolation And The Dress Strike

At the beginning of last season (Continued on Page 8)

RAVAGES OF DUAL UNIONISM

by William Z. Foster

We print below excerpts from Chapter III of *The Bankruptcy of The American Labor Movement* by William Z. Foster. The written more than a decade ago, this pamphlet approaches the question of dual unionism from the standpoint of the basic attitude to the trade unions as instruments of the workers in the economic struggle, and chastises mercilessly those utopians and would-be revolutionists who would destroy the existing unions and set up model revolutionary organizations.

We regret that he who wrote and spoke so eloquently against these dangerous and harmful conceptions, himself fell victim to the disease he fought. This, however, does not affect in the least the basically healthy attitude to the trade unions which Foster defends in the following lines.

—Editor.

Dual unionism is a malignant disease that sickens and debilitates the whole labor movement. The prime fault of it is that it wastes the efforts of those vigorous elements whose activities determine the fate of all working class organizations. It does this by withdrawing these rare and precious militants from the mass trade unions, where they serve as the very main-spring of vitality and progress, and by misdirecting their attention to the barren and hopeless work of building up impossible, utopian industrial organizations. This drain of the best blood of the trade unions begins by enormously weakening these bodies and ends by making impotent every branch of the labor movement as well; for the welfare of all Organized Labor, political, industrial, co-operative, educational, depends upon the trade unions, the basic organizations of the working class, being in a flourishing condition. Dual unionism saps the strength of the trade unions, and when it does that it undermines the structure of the entire working class organization.

The Dual Unions Fail

Since the dual union program was outlined almost thirty years ago by DeLeon it has wasted a prodigious amount of invaluable rebel strength. Tens of thousands of the very best men ever produced by the American Labor movement have devoted themselves to it wholeheartedly and have expended oceans of energy in order to bring the longed-for new labor movement into realization. But they were pouring water upon sand. The parched Sahara of dual industrial unionism swallowed up their efforts and left hardly a trace behind. The numerically insignificant dual unions of today are a poor bargain indeed in return for the enormous price they have cost.

Consider, for example, the Industrial Workers of the World. The amount of energy and unselfish devotion lavished upon that organization would have wrought miracles in developing and extending the trade unions, but it has been powerless to make anything substantial of the I. W. W. Today, 17 years after its foundation, that body has far fewer members (not to speak of much less influence) than it had at its beginning. The latest available official financial reports show a membership of not more than 15,000, whereas in 1905 it had 40,000. Even its former revolutionary spirit has degenerated until the organization has now become little more than a sort of league to make war upon the trade unions and to revile and slander struggling Soviet Russia. The I. W. W. is a monument to the folly of dual unionism.

The One Big Union of Canada is another example of rebel effort wasted in dual unionism. Four years ago it started out with a great blare of trumpets and about 40,000 members. Its advent threw dissonance into the old trade unions and shattered their ranks. They lost heavily in membership, the militants pulling out the more active elements on behalf of the O. B. U. Yet, today, this organization, despite the great effort put into it, has but an insignificant membership, not over 4,000 at most, and its constructive influence is about in proportion. It was a costly, ill-fated experiment, and in the main has worked havoc to Canadian labor. The Workers' International Industrial Union, another universal dual union, has occupied the attention of the Socialist Labor Party's active spirits for 14 years, but now it can muster only a few hundred actual members. Similar records of disastrous waste of rebel effort are shown by the dozens of dual unions started in the various single industries, all of which literally burned up the energies of the militants. Except for those in the textile, food, and shoe industries, which have secured some degree of success, these dual unions have all failed completely. They have absorbed untold labor of the best elements among the workers and have yielded next to nothing in return. Dual unionism is a useless and insupportable squandering of Labor's most precious life force. It is a bottomless pit into which the workers have vainly thrown their energy and idealism.

Devitalizing the Trade Unions

The waste of rebel strength, caused so long by dual unionism, has reacted directly and disastrously upon the trade unions. For many years practically all the radical papers and revolutionary leaders in this country were deeply tinged with dual unionism. In their program the ideas of secessionism and progressive unionism were welded into one. The consequence was that as fast as the active workers in the trade unions became acquainted with the principles of revolutionary union-

ism they also absorbed the idea of dualism. Thus they lost faith and interest in their old organizations, either quitting them entirely for some dual union, or becoming so much dead timber within them. The general outcome of this wholesale turning away of the progressive minority was to divorce the very idea of progress from the trade unions. It tipped in the bud, the growing crop of militants, the only element through which virile life and development could come to the old organizations. Dual unionism dried up the very spring of progress in the trade unions, it condemned them to sterility and stagnation. It was a long-continued process of slow poisoning for the labor movement.

A disastrous effect of this systematic demoralization and draining away of the militants is that it has thrown the trade unions almost entirely into the control of the organized reactionaries. In all labor movements the unions can prosper and grow only if the progressive elements within them organize closely and wage vigorous battle all along the line against the conservative bureaucracy. The militants must build machines to fight those of the reactionaries. But in the United States dual unionism has prevented the creation of such progressive machines. By its incessant preaching that the trade unions were hopeless and that nothing could be done with them, it discouraged even those militants who did stay within the unions and prevented them from developing an organized opposition to the bureaucrats. Poisoned by dual union pessimism about the old organizations and altogether without a constructive program to apply to them, the militants stood around idly for years in the trade unions while the reactionary forces

intrenched themselves and ruled as they saw fit. Because of their dualistic notions the militants practically deserted the field and left it to the uncontested sway of their enemies. If the American labor movement is now hard and fast in the grip of a stupid and corrupt bureaucracy, totally incapable of progress, dual unionism, through its demoralization of the trade union opposition, is chiefly to blame.

Disruption Through Secession

Dual unionism's steady drain upon the vitality of the trade unions by withdrawing and demoralizing the militants piecemeal has been ruinous enough, but the many great secession movements it has given birth to have made the situation much worse. It is the particular misfortune of the American labor movement that just when some trade union is passing through a severe crisis, as a result of industrial depression, internal dissension, a lost strike, or some other weakening influence, the dual union tendency breaks out with unusual virulence and a secession movement develops that completes the havoc already wrought. Exactly at the time the militants are needed the most to hold the organization together is just when they are the busiest pulling it apart. In such crises those who should be the union's best friends become its worst enemies. This has happened time and again. During the past two years, for example, the longshoremen and seamen have had bitter experience with such breakaway movements. Both organizations had lost big strikes, and both were in critical need of rebuilding and rejuvenating by the progressive elements.

But just at this critical juncture the latter failed, and, instead of strengthening the unions, set about tearing them to pieces with secession movements. Four or five dual unions appeared, and when they got done attacking the old organizations and fighting among themselves all traces of unionism were wiped out in many ports. Similar attacks are now being directed against the weakened railroad shopmen's unions.

A great secession movement, typical for its disastrous effects, was the famous "outlaw" strike of the switchmen in 1920. That ill-fated movement began because of a widespread discontent among the rank and file at the neglect of their grievances by the higher union officials. It was a critical situation, but had there been a well-organized militant minority on hand the foment could have been given a constructive turn and used as a means not only to satisfy the demands of the workers but also to defeat the reactionaries. But the long-continued dualistic propaganda in the railroad industry had effectively prevented the organization of such a minority. Hence, leaderless, the movement ran wild and culminated in the "outlaw" strike. Then, as usual, the secessionist tendency showed itself and a new organization was formed. The final result was disaster all around for the men. The strike was lost, many thousands of active workers were blacklisted, the unions were weakened by the loss of their best men, and the grip of the reactionaries on the organization was strengthened by the complete breakup of the rebel opposition. The "outlaw" strike of 1920 was one of the heavy penalties American workers have paid for their long allegiance to utopian dual unionism.

It is one of the saddest facts of American labor history that the Western Federation of Miners was finally destroyed by the very men who originally built it and made it one of the joys of the working class. What the Mine Owners' Association, with all its money and power, was unable to accomplish, the militants obsessed by dual unionism, brought about with little or no difficulty. Their allegiance to an impractical theory has broken up all organization among the metal miners. And the ravages that were made upon the W. F. of M. have been visited to a greater or lesser extent upon every other trade union in the United States, for all of them have had to suffer the loss of their most active workers and to confront as bitter enemies those very fighters who should be their main reliance.

Further illustrations might be cited almost indefinitely to show the baneful effects of dual unionism upon various working class organizations. By pulling the militants out of the trade unions and wasting their energies on futile utopian separatist organizations, dual unionism has robbed the whole working class of progressive leadership. It has thrown the great labor unions almost entirely into the hands of a corrupt and ignorant bureaucracy, which has choked out their very manifestation of real progress. And in stultifying and ruining the trade unions, dual unionism condemned to sterility every branch of the entire labor movement, industrial, political, and otherwise; for if the workers in general have not been educated to an understanding of capitalism and the class struggle, if they have not developed a revolutionary ideal, if they have not yet organized politically on class lines, if they have not yet produced a powerful co-operative movement—in every instance the cause may be directly traced to the paralyzing influence of the reactionary trade union bureaucracy, which dual unionism intrenched in power. The persistence, for a generation, of the fatal dual union policy is the true explanation of the paradoxical and deplorable situation of the United States, the most advanced capitalist country in the world, having the most backward labor movement.

IT SOUNDS FAMILIAR

(Continued from Page 2)

federation, nor of labor."—Daniel De Leon, 1905 I.W.W. convention.

"There is no case in the history of bygone organization in the labor movement where existing organizations have changed to meet new conditions."—Vincent St. John, *Why the A. F. of L. Cannot Become an Industrial Union*.

"The first duty of every revolutionist is to destroy the A. F. of L. There can be no revolutionary organization so long as it exists."—Joseph J. Ettor, *Samuel Gompers Smascherato*.

"We simply have to go at them (the trade unions) and smash them from top to bottom."—Tom Hickey, cited by Brissenden, *History of the I.W.W.*

"I would cut off my right arm rather than join the A. F. of L."—William D. Haywood.

"We don't want to save the Federation any more than to save the nation: we aim at destroying it."—Joseph J. Ettor, cited by Brissenden, *History of the I.W.W.*

"It has been said that this convention was to form an organization rival to the A. F. of L. This is a mistake. We are here for the purpose of forming a labor organization."—William D. Haywood, 1905 I.W.W. convention.

"This wormout system (trade unionism) offers no promise of improvement and adaptation. There is no silver lining to the clouds of darkness and despair settling down upon the world of labor."—Manifesto of conference forming I.W.W., 1905.

"It might as well be said if the fine energy exhibited by the I.W.W. were put into the Catholic Church (instead of the trade unions) that the result would be the workers' control of industry."—William D. Haywood, *International Socialist Review*, March, 1914.

A Christmas Carol

Fill up the glass and drink a toast of Christmas cheer
'Cause higher bracket incomes rose and rose and rose last year.
Give praise to God and NRA and Franklin D.
For the income tax reports of 1933.
Do you remember '33? The banks closed down
Gaunt hunger stalked the countryside and town
Starved men froze sleeping in windswept doorways
Mothers from fire-trap tenements spent their days
Rummaging in garbage pails for an evening meal.
This was the glorious year of the New Deal
Incomes of over a million dollars annually
Rose to forty-six in 1933
Forty-six rugged individualistic Americans
Good he-men, kind to their wives, baseball fans
Earned \$81,558,532
It was a swell year—a big improvement on '32
Fifteen million unemployed? "Just bums who shirk"
Look what can be done by energy, ability and work.
So drink a cup of Christmas Cheer
To incomes (forty-six of 'em) of over a million a year

—A. M.

JANUARY 15

is the date when the subscription price for the WEEKLY WORKERS AGE will be raised. The regular price will be \$2.00 per year and \$1.25 for six months.

TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE REMAINING MONTH TO SUBSCRIBE AT THE REDUCED RATES

\$1.50 for a year — 85c for six months

WORKERS AGE
51 WEST 14th STREET
NEW YORK CITY

Send me the WORKERS AGE for one year.....\$1.50
six months.....85 cents.

Name.....
Address.....
City..... State.....

1. This was written in 1922.
2. The O.B.U. of Canada was organized in 1919.

Workers Age

Published twice monthly by the
Workers Age Pub. Assn., 51 West 14 Street, New York, N. Y.
Phone: Gkaneray 3-8963

Organ of the National Council of the
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U. S. A. (DISPOSITION)
Subscription rates: Foreign \$1.50 a year, \$1.00 six months, 5 cents
a copy. Domestic \$1.25 a year, \$0.75 six months.

Vol. 3, No. 22.

December 15, 1934

As to "Red Terror"

THE tears shed by sundry individuals over the execution of three-score or so White Guards, monarchists, and varied enemies of the Soviet Union are in themselves most unimportant. What is, however, occasionally significant is the pedigree of the tear shedders.

It is in this light that we ask our readers to turn to Norman Thomas' "Timely Topics" in the New Leader of December 15th. Hardly having had a moment's rest after his latest masterpiece, "Human Exploitation," Norman Thomas turns with great energy and even greater fury to the "Soviet Terror." This leader of "militant" socialism in the United States is heartbroken over the fact that the Soviet government acted with such promptness and vigor in disposing of some of its blood-enemies. It is very peculiar that when Kiroff was murdered neither the New York Times, nor the New Leader, nor the Wall Street Journal, nor Simon Strunsky, nor Norman Thomas, burst a single blood vessel over this dastardly crime against the U.S.S.R. However, this is only one individual. "Why get excited, if you are a revolutionist, over the death of one individual? With the Soviet government it is almost four score individuals."

Here's the rub to this line of reasoning by the above galaxy. To have gotten excited over the murder of Kiroff would mean to get excited over a loss by the Soviet government, by the Russian people, or one of its most trusted and capable workers. To get aroused to white-heat over the instant meeting out of full and irrevocable justice to the White Guard assassins and to the imperialist spies would mean to get aroused over the enemies of the Socialist Soviet Republic. That's why silence in the case of Kiroff and raucous anger in the case of Soviet justice.

Nor is it an accident that Norman Thomas is instantly ready to close his eyes to the danger of imperialist war against the Soviet Union, to the multiplying and intensifying plots within and outside of the Soviet Union by the Hitler government, and, instead, seeks to find the cause of Kiroff's assassination in an inner-Party controversy. Thomas betrays woeful lack of the slightest knowledge of the situation in the Soviet Union today when he says (perhaps upon the advice of some of his latest recruits to the Socialist Party) that: "There seems to be some evidence that behind the assassination was an intra-Party fight of considerable political and economic importance . . . All this looks uncomfortably like Hitler's terrible bloodbath of June 30th." This is the reasoning of a "pure" bourgeois democrat, pure in the abstract but violently anti-working class in the concrete.

The proletarian dictatorship of the Soviet Union is to Norman Thomas just another dictatorship like the fascist dictatorship of Hitler Germany. At these conclusions we are not surprised. But let the workers in the Socialist Party draw another conclusion from this. Given Norman Thomas' loyalty to and faith in "genuine" and not "bogus" capitalist democracy, one cannot but be opposed in principle to a working class dictatorship as well as a capitalist-class fascist dictatorship. Such pseudo-socialists can only be for the so-called democratic rule of the bourgeoisie which is, in substance and in reality, only another type of exploiting class dictatorship over the workers and poorer farmers.

Even the most politically purblind might be expected to see that the assassination of Kiroff was not tied up with any economic difficulties in the Soviet Union or any political difficulties inside the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Soviet economic situation has been improved considerably. With all criticisms and shortcomings that can be registered in the evaluation of inner-Party life in the Soviet Union taken for granted, it must be recognized that the factional struggles in the Party are over, at least for the present and for some time. Witness the decision of the 17th Russian Party Congress for the extension and not the reduction of Party democracy. Besides, given an improvement in the economic situation, given increasing proof of the correctness of the general line of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in the U.S.S.R., where would there be a basis for such a sharpened political inner-Party fight to reach manifestations of a kind not reached in the Soviet Party even in the most bitter days of the most violent factional struggles of the past? Russian Bolshevik Party history does not show a single political assassination in its factional struggles which have been numerous and bitter. All assassinations (Volodarsky, Uritsky, the attempt on Lenin's life) were made by outright opponents of the Soviet regime.

Thomas and his colleagues are to be condemned in the most unmistakable terms by all honest socialists for their attempt to cover up the trail of the imperialist ring and its hired assassins banded against the Soviet regime. Every class-conscious worker can only hail the swift and complete justice accorded the culprits in the Soviet Union. Very likely if Judge Panken were to be in charge of the trial of these sworn enemies of the Soviet Union they would be given a trial more fair in the eyes of Thomas and O'neal. We, as class-conscious workers, as Communists, are more than satisfied with the accurate and complete justice instead of the bogus democratic justice that our Social-Democratic tear-shedders are demanding.

R. P. C. and United Front

THE report (Daily Worker, December 7, 1934) of the so-called "united front" entered into by Nat Ross, Communist Party organizer in the South, on the one hand, and certain outstanding revolutionary Socialists, on the other, must bring grave concern to

all sincere advocates of the unity of labor. For it is precisely the kind of "united front" that is no united front at all, that can serve only to discredit the idea of a genuine united front and to strengthen the hand of its enemies in the Socialist as well as the Communist movements.

What really happened in Chattanooga, if we are to place even the slightest trust in the Daily Worker report? Apparently, half a dozen or so members of the Socialist Party in the South, some of them leaders of the organization in their States BUT ALL ACTING AS INDIVIDUALS AND NOT IN ANY OFFICIAL CAPACITY, got together with Nat Ross and reached an agreement on a "program of specific issues." Was this in itself a united front as the Daily Worker announces? Of course not, it only because of all those involved, only Nat Ross officially represented his organization! All the rest were there as individuals. In fact, if it was anything more than a mere discussion, it was the notorious "united front from below," the very negation of the genuine united front and the greatest obstacle in the way of its realization. How much irreparable damage the confusion of the two has caused in the last few years, we know from sad experience. Perhaps it is only natural to find the official Communist Party relapsing into such sectarian tactics, for its much heralded return to sound Communist sense is unfortunately still almost altogether superficial in this country. But it is somewhat more surprising to find men who supposedly know better, participating in an irresponsible adventure of this kind!

And the issues themselves on the basis of which the "united front" is to be formed? According to the Daily Worker, the first is: "The struggle against war and Fascism." How it is possible to have joint action here as long as the official C.P. insists on hanging on to the narrow and thoroughly impotent American League Against War and Fascism as its "united front" in this field? The indispensable prerequisite for cooperation with the official C.P. in the struggle against war and Fascism, it seems to us, is surely the initiation of a NEW movement on a new and sound foundation.

The second issue is the "election of the delegates to the National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance." What is this "National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance?" Nothing but the latest puppet organization of the C.P., just another name for the bankrupt Unemployed Councils? It is merely another "Red" paper organization today and can never, in the nature of the case, become anything else! Sponsoring it are the Trade Union Unity League, the center of dual unionist disruption in the United States, as well as a whole string of "Red unions," each with a notorious record of disruption in its own particular field. Collaboration with such organizations on any issue at all is just simply out of the question to any one really interested in building the labor movement in this country. As the case of the American League Against War and Fascism shows, "united fronts" on the basis of the hopelessly narrow and stillborn "mass" organizations of the C.P. can lead only to confusion and disillusionment and, in the end, to a revulsion of feeling against the very idea of any sort of united front.

It is not necessary to examine all of the other issues in detail. Consider the fourth one: "A campaign to unionize the South and develop an aggressive rank and file trade union movement in the A.F. of L. . . . To 'unionize the South' into what—into the dual unions of the T.U.U.L. or into the A.F. of L.—or perhaps into the 'independent federation of labor' about which we used to hear so much a little while ago? To 'develop an aggressive trade union rank and file movement in the A.F. of L. . . .' on what basis—on the basis of the disruptive union-wrecking program sponsored by the C.P. in the A.F. of L. unions or on the basis of the program of constructive union-building championed by the progressive forces in the unions? Silence or evasion on a fundamental question of this sort is positively fatal, for it means virtual capitulation to dual unionism. That is exactly what has happened in the so-called Southern "united front!"

This whole incident is all the more puzzling in that the Socialists who participated in it are known to support the Revolutionary Policy Committee group in the S.P. and the position of the R.P.C. on the united front, as expressed in its program and in the editorial in the recent issue of its magazine, has been fairly sound on the whole. Without doubt, it is a case of the strong desire for united action, in itself certainly to be welcomed, breaking thru the ambiguous decision of the Boston session of the Socialist executive, but breaking thru it in a reckless and ill-considered manner, bound to strengthen the position of the right wing enemies of the united front, who can point to his "horrible example" to discredit the idea as such. And yet never was a genuine united labor front, a fighting block of workers organizations of all shades of political opinion, more vitally necessary than today. Let us hope, therefore, that this unfortunate incident will prove to be an isolated one and that those involved, recognizing the gravity of their error in a matter so vital, will profit by it in the future.

Stage and Screen

by Robert Arthur

The Theatre Union has gone into action again. In a season of plays which, with but a few exceptions, have brought forth mountainous groans and abundant teeth gnashing, the Union comes to give us a play of extraordinary adroitness and power. Moreover, "Sailors of Cattaro" is a challenge to any producing unit and the producers of "Peace on Earth" and "Stevedore" have met that challenge with all the sincerity they command. It is not enough. Let Mr. Atkinson, bored with the usual Broadway fare, outstrip himself in lavish praise of the Theatre Union's work, if it pleases him. We need not accept that critical

verdict as a final judgment. If the Theatre Union, thru the organization of an audience which assured it a run, was ready to disregard the bourgeois critics' almost unanimous dispraise of "Peace on Earth," it is in a better position now to turn its back on those critics and what it then called a "prejudiced bourgeois approach." The job of this organization is too important to be bungled. Therefore, let it not deceive itself. If its ammunition fails, let it admit it, and correct the errors, which enabled someone to fire a blank cartridge.

"Sailors of Cattaro" is the story of a bold brave fight—a mutiny of men upon a battleship—their temporary success—their ultimate

failure. It is of the heart-rending battle a few sailors wage in a desperate struggle for peace and freedom, and it follows the actual facts of the incident which it recounts of a mutiny which broke out in the Austrian navy at Cattaro and Pola during the last year of the war.

In this department's opinion "Sailors of Cattaro" is the most mature and important play the Theatre Union has done to date, a play of deep significance in the class struggle, written by an exile from Germany with the class consciousness of an artist. Melodrama it may be, its author, Dr. Wolf has seen life in the heart of action and he has given his play the abundance of living, that universality, which theatrical work can only possess as a synthesis of experience.

Plans are made thruout Austria for a general strike to end the war and capitalist exploitation of the masses. A comrade brings the news to the sailors aboard the cruiser St. George. In their quarters and as they scrub the decks, the sailors furtively plan a revolt as part of the general uprising. On February 1, 1918, at the opportune moment they surprise the captain in the chart room and take over command of the ship. For three days they have the upper hand but they cannot seem to reach an agreement with the men on the other boats in the harbor. Having entrusted their leadership to a wavering sailors council, which, blundering and indecisive, betrays its true leaders, the mutiny fails. Persuaded by the promises of amnesty made by the captain, and against the better judgment of the leader of the revolt, the men surrender. The red flag is pulled down, and, in complete violation of the captain's original promise the ringleaders are shot. A few valiant heroes chanced their luck on death or freedom, and partly thru an inordinate impracticability, lost.

Here is a play written at white heat of human conflict in emotional terms and yet neither the acting nor the adaptation is equal to the task set for it. At least one of the actors brings to his part neither the vigor nor the conviction it requires. And the rest are what their adaptor made them—figures in that unhappy twilight zone between one language and another. In scenes of sentiment the adaptation is puerile. In scenes of vigor it lacks clarity. The humor of the play is not even understandable. In adapting the play for America the gentleman who performed the job seems to have mistaken the electric precision of the play for primness!

And yet, with the aid of an exciting direction "Sailors of Cattaro," despite the language barrier, has an upstart vitality that no self-conscious play or writing will down. The difference between this and another famous version of a mutiny is that Potemkin had its Eisenstein but Cattaro needed an adaptor.

But don't let our disappointment dishearten you. "Sailors of Cattaro" should be seen by all means. It is an allegory of revolution. In this mutiny all the phases of revolutionary experience have their minor counterpart. Long after the memory of the play is gone its lessons will remain. Bottled up in the harbor, the sailors of the cruiser St. George offer us a practical lesson in revolt. Not only the cry for leadership but the understanding to follow it when it arises—these are matters of deep import. Because Wolf has written something more than a self-conscious diatribe against the forces of oppression his work deserves a treatment that is worthy of his own achievement.

If "Sailors of Cattaro" is not seen in the most favorable light let its producers look within the play itself for a practical lesson. Let us see to our weaknesses. For the revolution will not be won in a day. It is fought on countless fronts at every hour. On that not far distant day when the Theatre Union can match its skill with its high purpose the class struggle will have a mighty weapon to strike clearly at the heart of wrong.

America's Foremost Labor Weekly

Why do we believe the Weekly Workers Age will be America's foremost labor paper?

Because Jay Lovestone will conduct a weekly column catching history on the wing under the title of "At First Glance."

International news will be reported by August Thalheimer, one of the foremost Communist theoreticians in the world today, former editor of the "Rote Fahne," co-author of the program of the Communist International.

Bertram D. Wolfe, one of this country's leading left-wing critics, will run the Book Review column, reporting on all new literature of interest to workers.

The Stage and Screen reviews which have already won acclaim in the present Workers Age will be continued weekly in the new Age.

"Trade Union Notes" will con-

tinue to present a rapid but thorough survey of trends, tendencies and events in the trade union field week by week.

A brief and accurate outline of the commercial trends of the week will be presented in each issue under "The Economic Week."

The fun in the class struggle—and there is fun in the class struggle—will be handled in "Between Hammer and Anvil."

Because in addition to all these regular features each issue will contain many of the longer articles analyzing carefully and accurately some phase of the Communist and labor movement—the type of articles on which the Age has won its reputation.

If you want to know, to understand what is going on, if you want to work intelligently and effectively in your sector of the movement—you need the Weekly Age.

End the Drive by Jan. 1st

WE HAVE RAISED

\$1,425.70

WE NEED

\$3,000.00

(The figure in parenthesis is the amount previously contributed)

Ubert Ida(1.00)	1.00	Smith Lilly(5.00)	5.00
Ahearn Mike(2.00)	2.00	Steinberg Sophie (10.00)	5.00
Anthraxite Unit No. 1		S. E.(1.50)	3.50
CPO(5.00)	5.00	Shlachter Eva(2.00)	3.00
Brent Alice(7.00)	3.00	Stone Julius(2.00)	1.00
Beli Albert(4.00)	3.00	Shlachter B.(1.00)	5.00
Broder E.(5.00)	4.00	Siegel Eugene(1.00)	1.00
Broder J.(10.00)	5.00	S. R. B.(1.00)	10.00
Benjamin & Dorf (10.00)	10.00	S. B. E.(1.00)	3.00
Biecker H.(10.00)	5.00	Silverman Jennie(2.00)	2.00
Bernard Charlotte(2.00)	8.00	Strong Robert(2.00)	2.00
C. S.(15.00)	15.00	Sunnyside	
Blum M.(2.50)	2.50	Sympathizers(5.00)	5.00
Christman A.(10.00)	15.00	Tanzer L.(1.50)	3.00
Cork Jim(5.00)	5.00	V. S. Vivian(5.00)	10.00
Carigan J.(5.00)	5.00	Welsh Edward(1.50)	2.50
Cohen Rose(15.00)	5.00	Wright Edward(1.00)	2.00
Chicago Unit CPO(1.00)	1.00	Williams R.(5.00)	5.00
Cheskin Rose(10.00)	1.00	Zimmerman Charles(10.00)	10.00
D. M.(1.00)	1.00	COLLECTION LISTS	
Eisenberg A.(3.00)	5.00	Young B. on list 1202 ..	.50
Edwards Nellie(5.00)	5.00	H. Philip .10; E.	
Fisher Rose(5.00)	5.00	Lisle .25; Trop .15.	
Fay V.(5.00)	20.00	Stiglitz Saul on list 119	.75
Frances E.(3.00)	3.00	M. Tatz .25; H. Gross	
Granofsky(1.00)	1.00	.25; L. Levenson .25	
Glassman M.(3.00)	2.00	Hall Lee on list 1275 ..	.25
Hall Lee(2.00)	1.00	M. Gross	
Howard James(2.00)	1.00	Shachtman Rose on lists	
Hugget Howard(5.00)	2.00	107, -48, 109, 111 ..	2.85
Harris(3.50)	1.00	P. Kaplan .10; Fried-	
Jones Cora(2.00)	1.00	man .10; R. Zorn .25;	
Jenkins Clarence(5.00)	1.00	J. Smith .15; Lessor	
Kun Lou(4.00)	4.00	.25; Rifkin .25; M.	
Len(25.00)	25.00	Rombach .25; A. Ko-	
Lawrence Evelyn(3.00)	2.00	bel .25; P. Kutt .25;	
Lifshitz Gertrude(10.00)	10.00	E. Trauner .25; H.	
Linn Harry(3.00)	3.00	Jacobs .10; E. Davis	
Lawrence Mary(5.00)	5.00	.15; G. P. Caramanoff	
Lewis Bob(1.00)	1.00	.25; S. F. .25.	
Lury Minnie(3.00)	3.00	Schaeffer Wm. on lists	
Leonard Mary(10.00)	32.50	104, 105 2.65	
Macklin and		H. Friedman .10; W.	
Michael(35.00)	10.00	Goodman .10; G. Ilu-	
Michael Ray(87.94)	6.00	mok .10; L. Infrian	
Montreal Unit		.25; S. Wiener .25; E. J.	
CPO(1.00)	1.00	Tennenbaum .25; E. J.	
Marsh Joan(5.00)	5.00	De Leo .25; H. Good-	
Naveira Rosita(50.00)	5.00	stein .25; L. Nadel	
Nelson Louis(25.00)	25.00	.10; J. Alaimo .15; L.	
O. E.(1.00)	1.00	Gordon .25; O.	
Phillips John(3.00)	2.00	Schlossberg .25; M.	
Pickenback Helen(10.00)	10.00	Ezzer .10; J. Parness	
Pittsburgh Unit		.25.	
CPO(10.00)	10.00	Total \$505.50	
R. (Troy)(5.00)	10.00	Previously Listed ..	920.20
Roberts Jack(2.00)	2.00	Grand Total \$1,425.70	
Roland Sylvia(10.00)	5.00	Still to go \$1,574.30	
Stewart M. C.(5.00)	20.00		
Steinberg L.(5.00)	20.00		

JOIN THE COMMUNIST PARTY (Opposition)

COMMUNIST PARTY (OPPOSITION)

51 West 14th Street
New York City

I am interested in the work and tactics of the CPO. Please send me additional information.

Name
Address
City State

Hail the WEEKLY Workers Age



Union Developments In Workers Democracy Or Dictatorship

(Continued from Page 5)

The Industrial Union, supported by the cutters, called a general strike of the dressmakers. The response was excellent—about 3500 workers walked out. The militancy on the picket lines and in demonstrations was exceptionally high. Within five days of the call the strike was at its height and within the next five days it was practically all over.

There were of course many factors operating against the success of the strike: the season was not opportune and the lack of proper preparations. But let us assume that the Industrial Union knew what it was doing. Any honest worker with common sense, who knows the situation, must admit that the Industrial Union, lacking in resources and without the support of the general trade union movement, could not conclude the strike successfully.

When the support of the rest of the trade union movement was most needed the Industrial Union found that its campaign of slander against all other unions as "bosses unions" was responsible for its complete isolation. The sentiment today, among the dressmakers is for organization thru the I.L.G.W.U.

The Future Of The Industrial Union

The Industrial Union has lost all control in the shops. The local meetings of operators and finishers are very poorly attended. The pressers, mostly men, were hardest hit because they were replaced by girls. The cutters decided by an overwhelming majority to affiliate with the I.L.G.W.U. and have already been admitted. The cutters in the International the Industrial Union loses all hope of organizing the dressmakers. It is only a matter of time before the dressmakers become part of the general trade union movement.

If the ultra-left leaders would give up definitely their sectarian policy of "red" unions and recognize the all-inclusive unions as labor and not "bosses unions," they could, within a short time, win considerable influence in the unions. On the other hand if they continue their suicidal policy they will themselves be isolated and re-

chooses ... the form of democracy.

(Continued from Page 3)

Relation of Soviet To Proletarian Dictatorship

To Hook the proletarian dictatorship is simply and solely "workers democracy" thru soviets. He regards this as so obvious that he doesn't even bother proving it. But does Hook really believe that, with a policy opposed to the program of revolutionary Marxism, the soviets would still be organs of the proletarian dictatorship? Were the Russian soviets such from March to October 1917? Were the German soviets such in December 1918? They were certainly soviets of workers and soldiers deputies, democratically elected—the authentic expression of "workers democracy"—but were they the bearers of the proletarian dictatorship? Is it not clear that soviets become organs of proletarian dictatorship only when they adopt the program of the Marxist party? By fixing his fascinated gaze upon the formal aspects of soviet democracy, Sidney Hook misses completely the real substance, the class content, of the soviet dictatorship. But then, of course, Sidney Hook doesn't like dictatorship ...

(In the second article I will analyze Hook's plea for a many-party system under the proletarian dictatorship and discuss the real nature of soviet democracy.)

main discredited for quite a time.

The progressives in Montreal reject the anti-union attitude of the ultra-lefts. The joining of the dressmakers into the I.L.G.W.U. will mean the strengthening of the militant and progressive forces. The organization of the dress trade in itself requires a lot of militancy. The bringing together of the cloak and dressmakers into one union means to lift them from petty craft-selfishness to a higher level of workers solidarity.

**BUILD THE AGE
FOR UNITY**



THE NEW MONETARY SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES.

National Industrial Conference Board. 147 pages. \$2.00

This short treatise attempts to present the monetary policies of the Roosevelt regime within their historical context, with an additional section on the objectives and inflationary potentiality of these policies. Contrasting the pre-war monetary standard with the war and post-war developments, the shift from gold as the central and active medium of domestic exchange to central and commercial banks to control of currency with very liberal fractional reserves (i.e. less gold in proportion to commercial paper as a monetary backing) is a dominant fact, especially among the European countries. (The trend is also seen in U.S.A. before the crisis in the growing importance and functioning of the Federal Reserve System thru its central powers of rediscounting). The mere fact that in pre-war days the monetary gold stocks of the world constituted 24% of total supply of domestic money for gold standard countries while in 1928 the figure was reduced to 15% is empirical evidence or this point. Thruout the post-war world "the trend in monetary system ... was definitely away from the use of gold as the primary active money or the predominant base for other domestic money, even the gold was retained as the legal standard of value and ultimate monetary base."

Out of all this with the added intensification of the economic crisis, has come the new American monetary system based on a virtual system of the non-convertibility of paper dollars into gold. Monetary stock—whether of gold or paper quality—expands or contracts as a result of treasury regulation and policy in conjunction with the Federal Reserve system. Thus, gold is reduced to a nominal role, taking on the abstract position of a medium of evaluation with no actual, direct or active part in the functioning of the money and currency system. Even the international sphere of trade and exchange sees the restriction of gold movements in so far as the Secretary of the Treasury has ostensible control of international gold movements—in reality, all power goes back to the executive.

All of which leads to the objectives of this new monetary set-up. In short, it is the well-known attempt by the Roosevelt regime to secure a higher price-level (preferably one that equates itself with the 1926 price level). This is achieved—assuming the above set-up with executive control—by depreciation of the dollar thru reduction in gold content. Combined with the silver program, the resulting profits (approximately 6 or 6 billion dollars) create the objective basis for enormous inflationary possibilities.

This, in short, is the way in which the American money system is developing. The author, without much attempt at an integration of the monetary problems with the basic antagonisms of capitalist society, cannot offer much more than the solution of free trade, return to the gold standard, no restrictions on international trade movements and "mutual trust and cooperation by the nations of the world." In somewhat of an aside, however, the author presents an idea which if developed to its logical conclusion would get at the core of the problem—the contradictions in business economy. The author states: "When the crisis came in world economy, the stability of monetary systems, nominally employing gold, but actually using credit or non-gold commodity money, was immediately imperilled because the liquidity of assets backing his credit money was predicated on the assumption of sustained economic activity and prices." (Our emphasis).

—ECONOMIST